


RECEIVED

27 DEC 1999

Legal Staff
International DivisionCertificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No.: 703-308/6459) on DECEMBER 27, 1999. The communication includes 19 pages.

Signature of Sender:



Name of Sender:

HEIKE FREUDENMANN

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: LAUK

Application No.: 08/981,924

PCT No.: PCT/DE96/01269

Int. Filing date: 12th July, 1996Priority date: 12th July, 1995

Attorney docket No.: P2941 WO US

FOR: METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND TOLERANCE
OF A XENOGENIC SUBSTANCE ADMINISTERED TO AN ORGANISM.TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR REQUEST FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF RENEWED PETITIONAssistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231
U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a request for reconsideration of a pending petition.

(X) No additional fee is required.

() The fee has been calculated as shown below:

- () A Petition for Extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a)
- () Please charge Deposit Account Number 50-0355 in the amount of \$ for the Petition.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0355.
- (X) Applicant believes that no extension of term is required, beyond that petitioned for. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an additional petition and fee for additional extension of time.
- () Power of Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Paul J. Vincent
Reg.No. 37,461

Schuster & Partner
Wiederholdstr. 10
D-70174 Stuttgart, Germany
Telephone: +49-711-222 99 40
Fax: +49-711-299 594

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

In re Application of: LAUK

Application No.: 08/981,924

PCT No.: PCT/DE96/01269

Int. Filing date: 12th July, 1996

Priority date: 12th July, 1995

Attorney docket No.: P2941 WO US

FOR: METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND TOLERANCE
OF A XENOGENIC SUBSTANCE ADMINISTERED TO AN ORGANISM.

**Request for Reconsideration of Decision on Renewed Petition
under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(a).**

This communication is in response to the decision in the
subject petition dated November 12th, 1999.

The pending petition in the subject request for PCT
nationalization has been dismissed without prejudice, since
there was no evidence provided that the Federal Express
invoice corresponds to the 35 USC 371 application papers
received by the PTO on 13th January, 1998 and assigned
application number 08/981,924, wherein the applicant has not
proved that the basic national fee was forwarded from Germany
to the PTO on the 8th of January, 1998. The petition was also
dismissed without prejudice, since the standard delivery time
from Germany to the United States was 2 business days and
since the papers were allegedly deposited on Thursday the 8th
of January, 1998, two working days prior to the deadline, the
papers would normally have arrived on Monday the 12th of
January, 1998 which is the last day of the 30 month period

for submitting the basic national fee. A one day mailing or shipping delay can not be considered as unexpected, unforeseen or as an imperfection in the delivery service and the shipment of a package on the last possible day which would ensure its timely delivery is less than the care or diligence generally used and observed by careful men in their most important business.

In response to this decision, the applicant would like to submit further evidence and argumentation regarding the grounds for the decision. The applicant would like to subdivide discussion into two separate topics: 1) the issue of a correlation between the papers mailed by Federal Express as evidenced by the invoice and the subject application papers, and 2) the issue of due care and diligence.

1) With regard to the question of the correlation between the Federal Express invoice and the request for nationalization, the agent for the applicant would like to submit the following argumentation, facts and evidence. The Federal Express invoice indicates that a Federal Express mailing was dispatched on January 8th, 1998 from the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner to Box PCT USPTO. The Federal Express invoice also indicates that this mailing was delivered on January 13th, 1998 to the USPTO. There is no question that a request for nationalization in the subject petition application was made on January 13th, 1998. Therefore the date of delivery indicated on the Federal Express invoice correlates with the actual filing date of the subject request

for nationalization. The only remaining issue is whether or not the papers which were actually received on the 13th of January, 1998 correspond to the papers sent on January 8th, 1998 as evidence by the Federal Express invoice. This is clearly the case for the following reasons.

If the request for nationalization did not correspond to the Federal Express invoice then what possible contents could this Federal Express mailing have had? The only possibility could be that this Federal Express mailing corresponds to another mailing in another application pending before the USPTO involving the PCT office. This is referred to below as the alleged second mailing. Should such an alleged second mailing have been made, then there must have been two submissions to the USPTO Box PCT on Tuesday January 13th, 1998, one corresponding to the subject request for nationalization and a second corresponding to the alleged second mailing. However, since the time of delivery for Federal Express is two business days, assuming that the Federal Express invoice corresponds to an alleged second mailing, then the request for nationalization received by the USPTO, which the applicant represents was also sent by Federal Express, would have had to have been dispatched by Federal Express either on Thursday January, 8th or Friday January 9th, 1998 to have been received at the USPTO on January 13th, 1998. Under this scenario there would have been two mailings, one on January 8th, 1998 corresponding to the Federal Express invoice and a second mailing on either January 8th, 1998 or January 9th, 1998, also by Federal

Express, which corresponded to the received papers of the subject petition. However this scenario can not be true, since the Federal Express invoice shows one mailing only. In particular, the invoice of record is dated January 13th, 1998. Should there have been two mailings, on January 8th, 1998 and/or January 9th, 1998, then Federal Express would certainly have invoiced both of these mailings together. An examination of the invoice which has been submitted with the renewed petition shows however only one single entry. Moreover, no Courier Service other than Federal Express has ever been used by the agent for the applicant in his activities before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, when acting directly from Germany.

Assuming nevertheless an alleged second mailing, this alleged second mailing could only correspond to a communication to the USPTO in a parallel PCT nationalization application. The agent for the applicant began activities as counsel with the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner in October 1997. Prior to this time, the agent for the applicant had only been working with the Law Offices of Kohler, Schmid & Partner, also in Stuttgart. The first work in connection with Schuster & Partner was initiated with a request for nationalization of PCT/DE96/00866, assigned serial number 08/952,242 and filed at the USPTO on November 14th, 1997, applicant Wendler and attorney docket number P2909 WO US. A second filing involving the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner was an application due to Schill, attorney docket number P2915 WO US, which was a request for nationalization of PCT/DE96/00852, assigned US

serial number 08/952,241, also filed on November 14th, 1997. The third case involving work with Schuster & Partner with the agent for the applicant is the subject request for nationalization of this petition. A fourth case during this time period was a PCT nationalization request for an invention due to Honecker, attorney docket number PCT 2961, involving a request for nationalization of PCT/DE96/00852, assigned US serial number 09/000,054 and filed on January 22nd, 1998. There were no other pending applications filed by the agent for the applicant from the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner during this period of time. The Wendler and Schill applications were properly filed and there were no open deadlines regarding notices to file missing parts or the like. The Federal Express invoice of the subject petition cannot correspond to the Honecker application, since the Honecker application was filed on January 22nd, 1998. Therefore, there was in fact only one Federal Express mailing to the USPTO from Schuster & Partner on January 8th, 1998 and/or January 9th and that Federal Express mailing corresponded to the request for nationalization of the subject petition. Although other possible interpretations of the Federal Express invoice are conceivable, such interpretations are highly unlikely and are not reasonable. Request for reconsideration on this point is hereby made.

To provide evidence in support of the above mentioned statements regarding the issue of the correlation between the Federal Express invoice and the subject request for nationalization petition therefor, the applicant submits

Annexes A, B1 and B2. Annex A contains a list of final deadlines noted by the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner during the period of time during which preparations for the request for nationalization of the subject petitioned application were being made, extending from of December 21st 1997 to the 15th of February 1998. The entry for the subject petition application is indicated as docket number P2941 US due to LAUK and designated as a 30 month national phase deadline for the USA. The deadline of the 12th of January 1998 is properly noted. The only other PCT entry for the United States on this list is PCT 2961 due to HONECKER with the associated deadline of the 27th of January 1998 for the 30 month nationalization phase. Since this list contains all deadlines, including deadlines to respond to possible pending actions before the USPTO PCT office and since this list contains no entries corresponding to an alleged second mailing it is clear that there was no need for the applicant to submit an alleged second mailing on January 8th and/or 9th, 1998.

Turning to Annexes B1, B2, these annexes represent a Federal Express invoice received by the agent for the applicant in connection with his counsel activities for Kohler, Schmid & Partner. The Annexes B1 and B2 show that is general practice for Federal Express to issue multiple invoices involving a plurality of entries within several days of another. This provides evidence that no alleged second mailing occurred, since the invoice submitted in support of this petition shows only one invoiced entry.

Taken together these statements, arguments and evidence provide a clear and convincing indication that the most reasonable explanation for the Federal Express invoice submitted in support of this petition is that this invoice corresponds to the request for nationalization of the subject PCT application. Request for reconsideration is hereby made.

2) With regard to the second issue of due care, the agent for the applicant would like to make the following statements. As already mentioned above, the agent for the applicant began activities for the law offices of Schuster & Partner in November 1997. Two previous requests for PCT nationalization is had been made, both successful. The person carrying out the actual mailing work and noting the deadlines was Miss Nicole Strohmeng. The agent for the applicant worked closely with Miss Strohmeng and explained all necessary procedures for carrying out the nationalizing requests. The agent for the applicant was very pleased with the work of Miss Strohmeng and had complete confidence in her abilities. It later turned out that this confidence was not properly warranted.

On December 15th, 1997 Miss Strohmeng sent a declaration to the inventor for signature in the request for nationalization of the subject petition. On December 18th, 1997 the agent for the applicant reviewed all papers associated with the request for nationalization of the subject petition with Miss Strohmeng and signed a check dated December 18th, 1997 for

the fees in this application. On December 19th, 1997 the signed declaration was received in the morning mail at the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner. At this point of time, the application was complete for filing. However, on December 19th, 1997 Miss Strohmenge had a vacation day for carrying out a personal change of residence. On Monday December 22nd and Tuesday December 23rd Miss Strohmenge was on vacation. On Wednesday December 24th, and December 25th through December 28th, the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner were closed for Christmas vacation and over the weekend. On Monday December 29th, 1997 Miss Strohmenge returned to the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner but left early due to sickness. Miss Strohmenge returned to work on Tuesday December 30th, 1997 and worked a normal work day. On Wednesday December 31st, 1997 through January 6th, 1998 the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner were closed. On Wednesday January 7th, 1998 through Monday the 12th of January 1998, Miss Strohmenge simply failed to show up for work. She did not call and had no phone and since her residence had been changed, no one in the Law Offices knew where she was or how to contact her. As a result of this, her position with Schuster & Partner was terminated shortly thereafter.

During this entire period of time, the calendar of deadlines which had been kept by Miss Strohmenge was not reviewed by any other persons, since Miss Strohmenge was responsible for all of her deadlines and since it was normal Office Policy that the person keeping the respective calendar must either observe the deadline or notify a colleague. In particular,

since the application papers for nationalization were ready for filing on the 19th of December 1997 and the actual deadline for nationalization was the 12th of January 1998, there appeared to be a sufficient amount of time for filing the application, even under the circumstances. In particular, Miss Strohmenge could easily have filed the papers on the 29th of December 1997 or certainly at the latest on the 30th of December 1997. Moreover, had Miss Strohmenge notified the Law Offices of Schuster & Partner on the 7th of January 1998 that she was not coming to work, her calendar would have been checked by another paralegal assistant and the request for nationalization could have been dispatched one day earlier.

On January 8th, 1998 Heike Freudenmann discovered, through a routine check of the calendar of Miss Strohmenge, that the deadline for nationalization of the subject application had not yet been observed. She immediately dispatched the papers via Federal Express.

Ironically, despite the series of events, the papers would normally have been received by the USPTO in time for the nationalization deadline. The mailing would have normally been flown from Germany on Friday, January 9th and should have been received in the Washington D.C. area on late Friday afternoon January 9th, 1998. The papers would normally be ready for delivery on the next day on which the USPTO has opened, namely Monday January 12th. Therefore, due care was in fact taken on the part of the agent for the applicant but through a series of unusual circumstances, sickness, and

unexpected irresponsibility on the part of the paralegal assistant responsible for the case, the deadline was not met.

In support of the above statements, the agent for the applicant submits the following evidence. In particular Annex C is a true copy of a check written out and signed by the agent for the applicant in the subject request for nationalization. The check is dated December 18th, 1997 and shows the attorney docket number P2941WO US as well as the PCT serial number PCT/DE96/01296. The request for nationalization fee is included. This check provides evidence that the application was ready for mailing on or about December 18th, 1997. Annex D is a calendar indicating the vacation and sick days for the employees of Schuster & Partner for the time period of late December 1997. Miss Strohmenge is designated as "Ni" which is an abbreviation for her first name, Nicole. Examination of the calendar shows her absence on the days indicated in the previous paragraphs.

Annex E extends the calendar to 1998 substantiating the absence of Miss Strohmenge during the time period in question.

In conclusion, this communication provides sufficient reasonable evidence and argumentation to support the fact that, despite due care, the subject request for nationalization in the United States of the subject patent application was delayed. Request for reconsideration is hereby made.

11

Respectfully submitted



Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration Number 37,461

Agent for the Applicant

Schuster & Partner
Wiederholdstraße 10
D-70174 Stuttgart, Germany
Telephone +49-711-22 29 94 0
Fax +49-711-29 95 94

Enclosures:

Annexes A, B1, B2, C, D and E

PATENTANWÄLTE SCHUSTER & PARTNER

ANNEX A

ENDFRISTEN

Stand: 18.12.1997

Frist	Erl.? RN	Mandant	Stichwort	Bearbeiter
21.12.97	W 3190	Fröscher	Widerspruchserwiderung	Es
22.12.97	W 3898	Wakol	evtl. Widerspruch	Ni
04.01.98	W 3492 CT	Jauch	Anmeldegebühr + Vollmacht	Ni
05.01.98	W 3197	Schmidt-Hand	Stellungnahme zur Widerspruchsbegründung	Es
05.01.98	W 3261	Marcus Fischer	Erinnerung <i>- einlegen</i>	Es
06.01.98		Wakol	evtl. Widerspruch Interox ./ Intercoll	Es
07.01.98	W 3249	Linder	Widerspruchserwiderung	Es
08.01.98		Wylie	Nationale DE Phase einleiten	Ni
09.01.98	W 1506 BR	TOX	evtl. Widerspruch ./ Abtox	Es
10.01.98	W 2893	Schuster, R.	Erinnerungsbegründung	Es
10.01.98	TW 2815	Wendler	Erteilungs- und Jahresgebühren	Ni
11.01.98	iP 1854	Hohnecker	Prüfungsbescheid (1 x verlängert)	Vo
11.01.98	G 3037	Bärtle	Bescheidsäußerung	Vo
12.01.98	P 2941 US	Lauk,	30 M. nationale Phase - USA eingeleitet ?	Vo
12.01.98	W 3091 E	Wakol	Benutzungsnachweis <i>Früher</i>	Ni
12.01.98		Schuster /	Gerichtsgebäude Meldorf, 12 Uhr, Heide !!!	Es
15.01.98		Nerina	Impftermin Kinderlähmung	Es
17.01.98	P 3238 DE	MEDISANA	Prio	Vo
17.01.98	P 3422	Maja	Mängelbescheid	Ni
17.01.98	P 3378	Maja	Mängelbescheid	Ni
17.01.98	P 3385	Maja	Mängelbescheid	Ni
19.01.98		Reinh.	Rückmeldefrist + Zahlung Studiengebühren Reinh. Schuster	Es
19.01.98	P 3529	Hölzer	WV-Vo, da Präsentation geplant ist	Vo
21.01.98	W 3328	Hilt	Widerspruchserwiderung + Bescheidserledigung (Wvz)	Es
23.01.98	CT 2124	KARNA-BIOC	Bescheidsäußerung	Es
24.01.98	W 3414 CT	Schuster, Erika	Prio	Ni
24.01.98	CT 2918	Wolf	Bescheidsäußerung	Es
25.01.98	W 2185	Duclos	Benutzung	Ni
27.01.98	PCT 2961	Hohnecker	30 M. nationale Phase	Vo
30.01.98	W 3394	Schwartz	Prio	Es
31.01.98	W 2200 JP	TOX	Benutzung	Ni
01.02.98	P 2782	Kühner	Regel 51(4)	Vo
01.02.98	W 3171	LBS	Widerspruchserwiderung	Es
01.02.98	P 3345 DE	Renfer	Bescheidserledigung	Ni
02.02.98	P 3404	Günder	Priobeleg eingereicht? (P 3404 ist iP von Gründers eigener Anmeldung)	Ni
05.02.98	P 3183 DE	Kornherr	Prio	Vo
05.02.98	P 3182 DE	Wiedmann	Prio	Vo
05.02.98	P 3173 I DE	Arndt	Sequenzprotokoll einreichen	Vo
06.02.98	PCT 2896	Fleckenstein	Vorl. Prüfungsbericht	Ni
06.02.98	P 2909	Wendler	Vollmacht in Polen	Ni
09.02.98	PY 2736	Dr. Scholz	Legalized Power of Attorney in Paraguay	Ni
12.02.98	P 2941 EP	Lauk,	EP-Anmeldung eingeleitet + Gebühren gezahlt (31 Mon.)	Ni
13.02.98	W 3413	Flemig	Prio	Es
13.02.98	P 2815	Wendler	Regel 51(4)	Ni
15.02.98	W 3427 CT	PIV	Prio	Ni



66

Eingegangen	Fristablauf
am 20. MAI 1999	not: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vorbereitet: <u>66</u>	Vorfrist(en) not: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

FEDERAL EXPRESS EUROPE INC.
LANGER KORNWEG 34K

D-65451 KELSTERBACH

EMAIL: BILLDE@FEDEX.COM

TEL: 06107 937293

FAX: 06107 937455

ANNEX B1

KOHLER SCHMID & PARTNER
PATENTANWAELTE
RUPPMANNSTR 27

70565 STUTTGART

Umsatzsteueridentifikationsnr:
DE 111607161

Rechnungs Nr:	03645161
Datum:	13.05.1999
Kunden Nr:	1792-4762-3

(Bei Zahlung unbedingt angeben)

Umsatzsteueridentifikationsnr:

FRACHTRECHNUNG

Seite 1 / 2

Kopie

Versanddaten	Absender	Empfänger	Service	Pack- stücke	Gewicht	Betrag
A 400-5727-8760 STR - NDV 06 MAI 1999	KOHLER SCHMID & PARTNER PATENTANWAELTE RUPPMANNSTR 27 STUTTGART Ref. Nummer: P7136 US PCT DE 70565	BOX PCT USPTO CORRESPONDENCE & MAIL DI CRYSTAL PLAZA BLDG. 2, RM 1803 2011 SOUTH CLARK PLACE ARLINGTON VA US 22202 Zugestellt: 10 MAI 1999 08:45:00 Unterschrift: G.NEGASH	FedEx Pak	1	1,0 kg DMK	93,49
9					Nettobetrag DMK	93,49

Versanddaten	Absender	Empfänger	Service	Pack- stücke	Gewicht	Betrag
B 400-6313-6920 STR - NDV 04 MAI 1999	KOHLER SCHMID & PARTNER PATENTANWAELTE RUPPMANNSTR 27 STUTTGART Ref. Nummer: P7108US DE 70565	BOX MISSING PARTS US PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFF. CORR. & MAIL DIV. 2011 SOUTH CLAR CRYSTAL PL. BLDG. 2, RM 1803 ARLINGTON VA US 22202 Zugestellt: 06 MAI 1999 11:30:00 Unterschrift: G.NEGASH 08 MAI 1999 10:30:00 Siehe Rückseite: 08	FedEx Letter	1	0,3 kg DMK	79,41
6					Nettobetrag DMK	79,41

Versanddaten	Absender	Empfänger	Service	Pack- stücke	Gewicht	Betrag
C 400-5727-8723 STR - NDV 06 MAI 1999	KOHLER SCHMID & PARTNER PATENTANWAELTE RUPPMANNSTR 27 STUTTGART Ref. Nummer: P 6756US DE 70565	BOX CPA UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADE OFF. CORR. AND MAIL DIVISION CRYSTAL PLAZA BLDG 2, RM 1803 2011 SOUTH CLARK P VA US 22202 Zugestellt: 10 MAI 1999 09:45:00 Unterschrift: G.NEGASH	FedEx Letter	1	0,1 kg DMK	79,41
9					Nettobetrag DMK	79,41

Versanddaten	Absender	Empfänger	Service	Pack- stücke	Gewicht	Betrag
D 400-5727-8734 STR - NDV 08 MAI 1999	KOHLER SCHMID & PARTNER PATENTANWAELTE RUPPMANNSTR 27 STUTTGART Ref. Nummer: P6586 US PCT DE 70565	BOX ISSUE FEE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADE OFFICE, CRYSTAL PLAZA BLDG. 2 2011 SOUTH CLARK PLACE ARLINGTON VA US 22202 Zugestellt: 10 MAI 1999 08:45:00 Unterschrift: G.NEGASH	FedEx Letter	1	0,3 kg DMK	79,41
9					Nettobetrag DMK	79,41



Rechnungs Nr: 3645161
 Datum: 13.05.1999
 Kunden Nr: 1792-4762-3

Seite 2 / 2

ANNEX B2

Diese Rechnung gilt in Verbindung mit der Durchschrift des Luftfrachtbriefes (den Durchschriften der Luftfrachtbriefe) (Air Waybills) als Ausfuhrnachweis für Umsatzsteuerzwecke aller oben aufgeführten Exportsendungen gemäß § 10 Abs. Nr.1 UStDV 1993 und Abschnitt 133 Abs.3 Satz 1 UStR. Die Beförderung der in den genannten Luftfrachtbriefen aufgeführten Gegenständen wurde gemäß der Versandanweisung des Versenders durchgeführt. Ich versichere, daß ich die Angaben über die Versendung/Beförderung nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen aufgrund von Geschäftsunterlagen gemacht habe, die im Geltungsbereich der UStDV nachprüfbar sind.

Antje Schütt-Fahrenkrog, Geschäftsführerin

Diese Bescheinigungsform und der maschinelle Unterschriftenausdruck wurde genehmigt durch Verfügung der Oberfinanzdirektion Frankfurt am Main vom 13.01.1995, Az: S 07134 B - FEDEX/87 - St IV20

Gesamtbetrag (Steuerfrei)	EUR	169,61	DMK	331,72
Gesamtbetrag (*Steuerpflichtig)				
MWST				

TOTAL»	EUR *****169,61	DMK*****331,72
--------	-----------------	----------------

Zahlbar sofort nach Rechnungserhalt

Bitte achten Sie bei Ihrer Zahlung auf die Währung !

Fragen zur Sendung 0800 1230800 (gebührenfrei)

Rechnung geprüft am 20.5.99 von LU

<input type="checkbox"/> Kopie in Akt.	<input type="checkbox"/> Keine Kontokarte
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.) dort notiert	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.) Mand. berechnet
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.) Mand. berechnet	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.) Bezahlen sofort
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.) Kopie in Akt.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.) Kopie in Akt.

ANNEX C


DR. PAUL VINCENT *P2141W045*
13 LAUREL ST
PETERBOROUGH, N H 03458

0180
54-7018/2114

December 18 19 *97*

PAY TO THE ORDER OF *Commissioner of Patents + Trademarks* \$ *465.00*

Four Hundred Sixty Five and *100* *100* DOLLARS

 Peterborough Savings Bank
Peterborough, NH 03458

FOR *PCT/DE96/01296* *Paul Vincent*

⑆ 211470186⑆ 01 06 007171⑆ 0180

© HAWAIIAN 1991



DIE BARMER

Und der Mensch steht im Mittelpunkt.

Regionen				15.02.-17.02.	17.02.-19.02.	19.02.-21.02.	21.02.-23.02.
Hamburg	-	-	21.02.-27.02.	23.02.-27.02.	28.02.-01.03.	01.03.-03.03.	22.12.-23.01.98
Hessen	-	-	24.03.-12.04.	-	24.07.-05.08.	26.10.-25.10.	22.12.-01.01.98
Märkische-Brandenburg	03.02.-12.02.	22.03.-01.04.	18.05.-20.05.	28.06.-08.08.	04.10.-24.10.	22.12.-01.01.98	
Niedersachsen	-	24.03.-12.04.	08.05. u. 20.05.	17.07.-27.08.	20.10.-01.11.	22.12.-01.01.98	
Nordrhein-Westfalen	-	24.03.-12.04.	20.05.	03.07.-18.08.	13.10.-17.10.	22.12.-01.01.98	
Rheinland-Pfalz	-	20.03.-04.04.	-	23.07.-05.09.	20.10.-31.10.	22.12.-05.01.98	
Saarland	-	24.03.-12.04.	-	24.07.-03.08.	20.10.-31.10.	22.12.-01.01.98	
Sachsen	13.02.-21.02.	28.03.-24.04.	18.05.-20.05.	17.07.-27.08.	16.10.-24.10.	22.12.-03.01.98	
Sachsen-Anhalt	10.02.-22.02.	01.04.-04.04.	20.05.-24.05.	17.07.-27.08.	22.10.-01.11.	22.12.-05.01.98	
Schleswig-Holstein	-	21.03.-07.04.	-	18.06.-02.08.	06.10.-18.10.	22.12.-01.01.98	
Thüringen	10.02.-18.02.	24.03.-05.04.	18.05.-20.05.	17.07.-27.08.	20.10.-26.10.	22.12.-07.01.98	

7. Stand bei Buchhaltungswerkstoff – Aussagen richtig oder falsch?

[illegible]

1998

ANNEX E

JAN

FEB

MÄRZ

APRIL

MAI

1 DO Neujahr	1 SO	1 SO	1 MI Wi	1 FR Maifeiertag
2 FR Ni, Wi, Ri, Fr	2 MO Ri, Fr	2 MO Ni Urlaub	2 DO Wi	2 SA
3 SA	3 DI	3 DI Ni krank	3 FR Wi 1/2 Tag	3 SO
4 SO	4 MI	4 MI Wi krank	4 SA	4 MO
5 MO Ni, Wi, Ri, Fr	5 DO	5 DO Ni krank	5 SO Palmsonntag	5 DI
6 DI Heilige Drei Könige	6 FR	6 FR	6 MO	6 MI 15
7 MI Ni krank Wi	7 SA	7 SA	7 DI	7 DO
8 DO Wi, Ri Ni krank	8 SO	8 SO	8 MI	8 FR Fr 1/2 Tag
9 FR Wi, Ri Ni krank	9 MO	9 MO Wi Ni krank	9 DO Gründonnerstag	9 SA
10 SA	10 DI	10 DI	10 FR Karfreitag	10 SO Muttertag
11 SO	11 MI 11.12. Ni	11 MI Ni krank	11 SA	11 MO 20
12 MO De, Wi Ni krank	12 DO 12.12. Ni	12 DO	12 SO Ostersonntag	12 DI
13 DI Ni krank	13 FR	13 FR	13 MO Ostermontag	13 MI 16
14 MI	14 SA Valentinstag	14 SA	14 DI Ni krank	14 DO
15 DO	15 SO	15 SO	15 MI	15 FR
16 FR De	16 MO Wi krank	16 MO	16 DO	16 SA
17 SA	17 DI Ni 17.12.	17 DI	17 FR	17 SO
18 SO	18 MI 1/2 Tag Fr	18 MI Fr	18 SA	18 MO 21
19 MO 19.12. 1/2 T	19 DO	19 DO	19 SO	19 DI
20 DI	20 FR Wi	20 FR Frühlingsanfang	20 MO	20 MI 17
21 MI	21 SA	21 SA	21 DI	21 DO Christi Himmelfahrt
22 DO	22 SO	22 SO	22 MI	22 FR Wi 1/2 R
23 FR	23 MO Rosenmontag	23 MO	23 DO	23 SA
24 SA	24 DI Wi 1/2 Fastnacht	24 DI	24 FR	24 SO
25 SO	25 MI Wi Aschermittwoch	25 MI	25 SA	25 MO 22
26 MO Ni	26 DO	26 DO	26 SO	26 DI